Remarks

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested in light of the remarks below. Claims 25-28 and 53-71 remain pending.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the time afforded applicants' attorney, Blanche E. Schiller, and applicant, Mark Schultz, during a telephone conference on January 14, 2003, in which the term "circumferential systematic error" was discussed. No agreement was reached during that telephone conference.

In the Office Action dated October 16, 2002, claims 25 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamakoshi et al. Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse this rejection.

In one aspect of applicants' invention, applicants claim a method for correcting for systematic errors in the writing of timing patterns on a storage medium by a head of a recording device. The method includes, for instance, detecting one or more circumferential systematic errors; and correcting for the one or more circumferential systematic errors. Thus, in applicants' invention, circumferential systematic errors are being detected and corrected.

Applicants respectfully submit that circumferential systematic errors are systematic errors that vary circumferentially (i.e., around the track). In particular, a circumferential systematic error is, for instance, a read-to-write time (the difference between the command to write time and subsequent readback time relative to the disk frame of reference), which varies along the track, while remaining relatively constant among neighboring tracks. Possible sources of such a variation include disk processing induced variations in magnetic characteristics, such as coercivity and electronic system delays, which vary within a writing revolution in a systematic way, perhaps due to thermal phenomena. Such a circumferential systematic delay is nominally attached to some portion (e.g., a pie slice) of the disk surface. Each separate circumferential systematic delay may be adjusted during the process, but is nominally the same for neighboring tracks (see IAC_j in the specification).

In contrast, Yamakoshi does not teach or suggest systematic errors that vary circumferentially, but instead, teaches errors that vary radially. In support of the rejection, the Office Action states: "The Examiner has interpreted circumferential systematic errors as errors such as separations between read and write elements or non-parallel read and write elements." Applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation. The delay caused by the physical separation of the read and write elements within the head does not, in and of itself, produce a circumferential systematic error. That is, the physical separation does not cause a systematic error that varies circumferentially. Instead, the physical separation produces a radially varying systematic error, which is nominally constant along any given track. Thus, the errors in Yamokoshi are radial in nature, in that they vary from track to track, rather than sector to sector (see Yamokoshi et al. at, for example, Col. 12, lines 17-29). Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that Yamokoshi does not anticipate, teach or suggest applicants' claimed invention.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claims 57-71, and the indication of allowability of claims 26-28 and 54-56, if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have not rewritten these claims in independent form at this time, since applicants believe the claims from which they depend are patentable.

Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this application, please contact applicants' attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Blanche E. Schiller

Blanche E. Schiller
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,670

Dated: January 16, 2003

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579